

REMARKS

Objection to Specification

The abstract of disclosure was objected to because it failed to recite any process steps.

Accordingly, the Abstract has been amended to recite process steps. Thus, the objection has been overcome.

The title of the invention was objected to because it allegedly was not descriptive.

Accordingly, the title has been amended to make it sufficiently descriptive. Thus, the objection has been overcome.

The specification was objected to because trademarks were not capitalized.

Accordingly, the specification has been amended to capitalize trademarks. Thus, the objection has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Accordingly, claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saint Victor (U.S. Patent No. 6,211,308 B1) in view of Tugwell (US 4,037,008 A).

Claim 6 has been amended to recite, among other things, “wherein said screen has a mesh size coarser than a standard mesh size specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink.”

Admitting that Saint Victor does not teach the use of a screen having a mesh size coarser than a standard mesh size, the Examiner alleged that Tugwell teaches that the mesh size is a result-effective variable and may be adjusted depending upon the viscosity of the ink utilized as well as the thickness and degree of detail desired. Tugwell describes as follows:

The silk-screen material is available in several meshes to accommodate various needs. The finer the screen mesh, the finer the detail which can be achieved. Fine mesh screens require thinner ink viscosity and consequently deposit thinner layers of ink. Coarse mesh screens will allow heavy deposits of more viscous inks, but do not allow fine detail.

(Column 2, lines 20-26). Thus, Tugwell simply explains general tendency that the more viscous the ink becomes the coarser the required mesh becomes. Here, Tugwell is discussing the ordinary standard screen printing, and nothing indicates that the screen has a mesh size coarser than a standard mesh size specified for ordinary screen printing of the ink.

Thus, Saint Victor and Tugwell does not teach or suggest “wherein said screen has a mesh size coarser than a standard mesh size specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink.”

Response to Non-Compliant Amendment
Application No. 10/541,898
Attorney Docket No. 052788

For at least these reasons, claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Saint Victor and Tugwell.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Sadao Kinashi

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 48,075

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/ar